

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above Amendment and these Remarks are in response to the Office Action mailed April 7, 2009. Claims 1-33 and 35 were pending prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-33 and 35. This Response amends Claims 1-4, 6, 13-15, 17, 23-25, 27; cancels Claim 35 and adds new Claim 36, leaving for the Examiner's consideration claims 1-33 and 36. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claims 1-6, 8-9, 13-17, 19, 23-27, 29, and 33 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0278585 to Spencer in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,493,868 to DaSilva et al.

Claims 7, 10-12, 18, 20-22, 28 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spencer in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,051,316 to Charisius.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature of using at least one abstract view to display and/or edit a content of a data structure in a server page application, rather than the underlying physical data structure being used to represent the content in corresponding machine generated code, such as servlets. Here, the machine generated code is automatically generated in a programming language from the server page application, and it can be further compiled into binary code for execution.

Spencer discloses showing the expressions and information in a floating or movable window, either above the source code, or attached to the source code in the locations that they are relevant to. (Paragraph 0022, Line 10-13).

DaSilva discloses adding probe-points to manage input and output stream data in an integrated code development tool (Column 11, Lines 31-61).

Applicant respectfully submits that Spencer and other prior art do not teach or make obvious that an abstract view can be used to display and/or edit an abstract content of a data structure in a server page application, rather than the underlying physical data structure being

used to represent the abstract content in corresponding machine generated code in a programming language.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 13, 23, and 33

Claims 13, 23, and 33, while independently patentable, recite limitations that similarly to Claim 1 are not disclosed nor rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 36

Newly added Claim 36 depends on Claim 1. In addition, Claim 36 includes the feature of *“the at least one filter is used to extract data from and manipulate one or more contents in a buffer used to transmit and receive streaming data, wherein the at least one filter allows a user to view the at least one data structure in a data stream relative to one or more tag library associated with the server page application using intermediate data created by the one or more tag library, wherein the intermediate data created by the one or more tag library is not sent back to the data stream.”*

Applicant respectfully submits that Spencer and other prior art do not teach or make obvious this feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 36, as added, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-12, 14-22, and 24-32

Claims 2-12, 14-22, and 24-32 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

II. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application are allowable, and Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 7, 2009

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No.: 80548
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, Fourteenth Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800